UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/630,283	07/29/2003	Charles W. Kaufman	LOT920030007US1	9707

23550   7590   12/12/2008
HOFFMAN WARNICK LLC
75 STATE STREET
14TH FLOOR
ALBANY, NY 12207

EXAMINER
DADA, BEEMNET W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2435	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/12/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTOCommunications@hoffmanwarnick.com

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE **3** MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _03 November 2008_.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1,2 and 4-39_ is/are pending in the application.
     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) _1,2 and 4-39_ is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
     a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
         1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
         2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
         3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on November 03, 2008 has been entered. Claims 1, 11, 18 and 20 have been amended. Claims 1, 2 and 4-39 are pending.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed November 3, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the art on record fails to teach determining if the one command is required to be associated with the security value, executing the one command ... with the security value; preventing execution of ... or if there is an error in the security value. Examiner disagrees.

Examiner would point out that, Levergood teaches associating the security value with a set of uniform resource locators (URLs) corresponding to a set of commands of the distributed application [column 5, line 49-column 6, line 4 and column 7, lines 14-31], determining if the one command is required to be associated with the security value [column 5, lines 35-40], executing the one command if the one command is not required to be associated with the security value [column 5, lines 35-40], and if the one command is required to be associated with the security value [column 5, lines 41-50], checking the one URL for the security value (i.e., check if SID is attached to the URL) [column 5, lines 41-49 and column 6, line 65-column 6, lines 26 and column 7, lines 35-47], and returning an error message to the authenticated user if the security value is not found with the one command or preventing execution of the one command, wherein

the error message prompts the authenticated user for confirmation before the one command

can be executed (i.e., if SID is not detected with the URL, redirecting it back to the client and

requesting the client to submit authentication credentials again for validation/confirmation

column 5, lines 46-50 and column 7, lines 41-49). Examiner would point out that the art on

record teaches the claim limitations and therefore the rejection is respectfully maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2 and 4-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Levergood et al. US 5,708,780 (hereinafter Levergood) in view of applicant's own admitted prior

art (hereinafter AAPA) and further in view of Abdo et al. US 7,080,404 B2 (hereinafter Abdo).

As per claims 1, 4, 8-11, 18, 20, 21, 24, 26-29, 31, 32 and 35, Levergood teaches a

method for protecting a distributed application user, comprising:

providing a distributed application on a server (i.e., web-pages on a server) [column 5,

lines 17-41];

authenticating a user of the distributed application [column 5, lines 41-50 and column 6,

lines 27-50];

determining, on the server, a single security value for the authenticated user (i.e., SID is generated for an authenticated user) [column 5, lines 41-64 and column 6, lines 53-column 7, line 13];

associating the security value with a set of uniform resource locators (URLs) corresponding to a set of commands of the distributed application [column 5, line 49-column 6, line 4 and column 7, lines 14-31];

communicating the security value to a client operated by the authenticated user [column 5, line 49-column 6, line 4 and column 7, lines 14-31];

receiving one of the set of URLs on the server from the client [column 5, line 64-column 6, line 16 and column 7, lines 14-21];

determining if the one command is required to be associated with the security value [column 5, lines 35-40];

executing the one command if the one command is not required to be associated with the security value [column 5, lines 35-40]; and

if the one command is required to be associated with the security value [column 5, lines 41-50];

checking the one URL for the security value (i.e., check if SID is attached to the URL) [column 5, lines 41-49 and column 6, line 65-column 6, lines 26 and column 7, lines 35-47], and returning an error message to the authenticated user if the security value is not found with the one command or preventing execution of the one command, wherein the error message prompts the authenticated user for confirmation before the one command can be executed (i.e., if SID is not detected with the URL, redirecting it back to the client and requesting the client to submit authentication credentials again for validation/confirmation column 5, lines 46-50 and column 7, lines 41-49).

Levergood teaches associating the security value with a set of uniform resource locators

(URLs) corresponding to a set of commands of the distributed application [column 5, line 49-

column 6, line 4 and column 7, lines 14-31], but is silent on a command comprising a command

that can be used in a malicious attack against authenticated user. However, AAPA teaches

associating the security value with a set of uniform resource locators (URLs) corresponding to a

set of commands of the distributed application, wherein each command comprises a command

that can be used in malicious attack against authenticated user [see specification pages 1-2

paragraphs 2-4]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at

the time of applicant's invention to employ the teachings of AAPA within the system of

Levergood in order to enhance the security of the system.

Levergood is silent on generating a security value for an authenticated user of the

distributed application, wherein every user is authenticated prior to generating the security value

and the security value is a pseudo-random number.

Abdo teaches an authentication system, including generating a security value for an

authenticated user of the distributed application, wherein every user is authenticated prior to

generating the security value and the security value is a pseudo-random number [column 4,

lines 18-53]. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention to employ the teachings of Abdo within the system of Levergood and AAPA

in order to further enhance security of the system.

As per claims 2, 12, 19 and 30, AAPA further teaches the method, wherein the one

command comprises a command to delete files of the authenticated user [see specification

pages 1-2 paragraphs 2-4].

As per claims 5, 17, 22 and 33, Levergood further teaches the method further comprising storing the security value on the server [column 6, lines 5-23].

As per claims 6, 13, 23 and 34, Levergood further teaches the method further comprising: associating the security value with session information corresponding to the authenticated user, and communicating the session information and the security value to the authenticated user [column 6, lines 5-23 and column 7, lines 14-21].

As per claims 7, 25 and 36, Levergood further teaches the method wherein the authenticated user operates a client that communicates with the server [column 6, lines 22-26].

As per claims 14 and 37, Levergood further teaches the method wherein the associating step comprises appending the security value to a set of URLs corresponding to a set of commands of the distributed application [column 5, line 49-column 6, line 4 and column 7, lines 14-31].

As per claims 15 and 38, Levergood further teaches the method wherein the one URL is pre-constructed on the server, and wherein client receives the one URL and the associated security value from the server [column 7, lines 14-33].

As per claims 16 and 39, Levergood further teaches the method wherein the one URL is constructed on the client, and wherein the associating step comprises, extracting the security value on the client, and appending the security value to the one URL [column 5, lines52-65].

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BEEMNET W. DADA whose telephone number is (571)272-3847. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (9:00 am - 5:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y. Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Beemnet W Dada/

 Examiner, Art Unit 2435

December 6, 2008